

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 21, 2008 the Office noted that claims 11-21 were pending and rejected claims 11-21. Claim 21 has been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 11-21 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 11-18, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Safadi, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0126086. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Safadi discusses a possible conversion of a DRM original scheme to a DRM native scheme, the native scheme being the one accepted by a consumer device that requested the content.

The DRM scheme is delivered with the content from a content provider and is associated with this content.

Even if in the list of the native scheme, usage rights is included, the rule of this DRM scheme is described as a means to protect the content itself, not a usage right controlling the right or condition to use the content. The application described in Safadi for the DRM scheme is always related to the content protection itself.

Further, in Safadi, there is no mention of an exchange

of information on expression languages used in the entities. There is no mention of a list declaring one or more use rights expression languages from the consultation station. There is no mention of a plurality of rights expression language that can be accepted by the consultation station.

Therefore, there is no mention of a priority order that can be associated with the list of the rights expression language.

To further emphasize these differences, the Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite "A system for accessing, at a consultation station, information associated with rights to use said information, the use rights being expressed in a particular rights expression language, the consultation station including use rights recovery means adapted to recognize use rights expressed in one or more different languages in order to access said information **and including means for declaring a list of the one or more use rights expression languages with a priority order**, which system includes a use rights adaptation unit including means for receiving use rights data associated with the information to be accessed; and means for analyzing said use rights data to determine said particular rights expression language in which said use rights associated with said information are expressed, the user rights adaptation unit being associated with means for determining the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said

consultation station, and further including means for comparing the said particular rights expression language with the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station to determine if said particular right expression language is recognized by said recovery means; and use rights conversion means for converting the use rights associated with said information when expressed in a language that is not recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station from said particular language in which the use rights associated with the information are expressed to another language selected from the **list of the** one or more languages recognized by said recovery means of the consultation station **by taking into account the priority order of the languages in the list.**" (Emphasis added)

Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in claim 13, and ¶ 0050, 0053, 0055 and 0060 of the printed publication version of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the amendment of the Specification.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Safadi in view of Bormans. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an

argument.

Bormans adds nothing to the deficiencies of Safadi as applied against amended claim 1. Therefore, Safadi and Bormans, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 19.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 11-21 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston/

James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Reg. No. 55,394  
209 Madison St, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb